

35 USC 103(a) REJECTION OF CLAIMS 9 AND 22

The examiner rejected claims 9 and 22 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eastman in view of BlendPro, in further view of WorldWide Testing. Applicant respectfully submits that that Eastman in view of BlendPro falls short of teaching or suggesting a system or method including modifying a starting point formulation based on target characteristics input by a user and then providing for the purchase of a chemical product so formulated, as presented above and that WorldWide Testing does not perfect that teaching. Applicant respectfully concludes that his claims 9 and 22 are not unpatentable over Eastman in view of BlendPro, in further view of WorldWide Testing under 35 USC 103(a). Applicant respectfully requests the examiner to withdraw this rejection.

35 USC 103(a) REJECTION OF CLAIMS 10-11

The examiner rejected claims 10-11 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eastman in view of BlendPro, in further view of WorldWide Testing,), in further view of official notice regarding e-commerce. Applicant respectfully submits that that Eastman in view of BlendPro falls short of teaching or suggesting a system or method including modifying a starting point formulation based on target characteristics input by a user and then providing for the purchase of a chemical product so formulated, as presented above and that neither WorldWide Testing nor the official notice regarding e-commerce, separately or together, perfect that teaching. Applicant respectfully concludes that his claims 9 and 22 are not unpatentable over Eastman in view of BlendPro, in further view of WorldWide Testing,), in further view of official notice regarding e-commerce. under 35 USC 103(a). Applicant respectfully requests the examiner to withdraw this rejection.

that "Eastman does not teach a system or method where users are given a tool that aids them in finding chemical customized products using their own chosen starting point formulation and their desired specifications". Applicant agrees and respectfully points out that Eastman explicitly discloses (Eastman, page 2, paragraph 5) that their marketplace creates "multivendor catalogs and a rich product offering ... to reduce total costs of procurement and the costs of sales and marketing for thousands of companies worldwide". Applicant respectfully submits that Eastman is directed to an online catalog with a variety of fixed offerings, and does not provide identification of any problem nor motivation to solve it.

BlendPro provides a tool "to enable formulators to tailor cosolvent blends" for control of evaporation rates and viscosity of coatings formulations. BlendPro provides information based on the physical properties of a catalog of available solvents which enables a formulator to select and purchase desirable available individual solvents and to use them in devising a coating formulation. BlendPro does not provide any teaching, suggestion or motivation to a system or method of providing for the sale of customized products to a user interacting with the software.

Applicant respectfully submits that Eastman in view of BlendPro falls short of teaching or suggesting a system or method including modifying a starting point formulation based on target characteristics input by a user and then providing for the purchase of a chemical product so formulated, as claimed by applicant. Applicant respectfully concludes that his claims 6-7, 12, and 20-21 are not unpatentable over Eastman in view of BlendPro under 35 USC 103(a). Applicant respectfully requests the examiner to withdraw this rejection.